

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/728,343	12/01/2000	Gary Mark Crosbie	200-0188 4125		
28395	7590 02/10/2004		EXAMINER		
BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C./FGTL 1000 TOWN CENTER			SAMPLE, DAVID R		
22ND FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SOUTHFIELI	O, MI 48075-1238		1755		

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u> </u>			ML		
		Application No.		Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/728,343	,	CROSBIE, GARY	MARK		
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		David Sample		1755			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cove	r sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL'MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, how by within the statutory mi will apply and will expire s, cause the application	ever, may a reply be tim nimum of thirty (30) day: SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this or D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.		
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 N	lovember 2003.					
·	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	 Claim(s) 1-6,13,14,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) 3,4 and 6 is/are allowed. 						
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) ob drawing(s) be held tion is required if th	I in abeyance. See ne drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 Cl			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been rece ts have been rece writy documents h u (PCT Rule 17.2	eived. eived in Applicati ave been receive 2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage		
2) Notice	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal P		O-152)		
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06) er No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/30/2003</u> .	6)		, ,	,		

Art Unit: 1755

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I in the response filed 11/13/2003 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 13-18 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected an invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made without traverse in the paper filed 11/13/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 14, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 19 and 20 currently recite: "the matrix composition remaining in a glassy state after sealing at temperatures up to 1200°C." The closest recitation in the specification is:

Art Unit: 1755

When the first or second matrix glass composition is physically mixed with certain finely divided ceramic powders, such as Mg₂SiO₄, a sealing glass with an overall third or fourth chemical composition is formed which seals to yttria-stabilized zirconia upon firing at about 1150 - 1200°C.

This portion of the specification, and the remainder of the specification, fail to refer to the state of the glass upon firing. The specification states that the composition seals to an SOFC upon firing at 1150-1200°C, but fails to refer to the state of the glass upon firing (i.e., glassy or crystallized). For this reason, claims 1, 2, 5, 19 and 20 are not supported by the specification as originally filed.

As to claims 1, 2 and 5, the specification states that it is the mixture of the glass and Mg₂SiO₄ which results in a composition that can be sealed to an SOFC. There is no description that the glass alone (as in claims 1, 2 and 5) can be sealed to an SOFC.

Lastly, claims 14, 19 and 20 recite that the composition contains 15-40, or 20-35 weight percent Mg₂SiO₄. The examiner was unable to locate this recitation in the specification as originally filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1755

Claims 1, 5, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morrissey et al. (US Patent No. 3,022,179).

Morrissey et al. discloses a glass composition that the examiner believes has overlapping ranges of components with the glass of the present invention. Further in this regard, a theoretical composition containing 50 wt% SiO₂, 35 wt% BaO, 12 wt%Al₂O₃ and 3 wt% MgO (within the scope of Morrissey) converts to a glass containing 66 wt%SiO₂, 18 mol% BaO, 9 mol% Al₂O₃ and 6 mol% MgO (a composition within the instant claims). Overlapping ranges have sufficient to establish *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

The reference discloses the presence of additional "fluxing agents" whereas the instant claims employ "consisting essentially of" language. However, there is nothing of record to suggest that components such as Al_2O_3 or MgF_2 would materially affect the novel or basic characteristics of the present composition.

Since the composition of the reference and the composition of the claims have overlapping ranges of components, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected the glass of the reference to have the claimed properties.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4, and 6 are allowed. The prior art fails to disclose or suggest the recited glass composition in mixture with forsterite, Mg₂SiO₄.

Art Unit: 1755

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Sample whose telephone number is (571)272-1376. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Bell can be reached on (572)272-1362. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Sample Primary Examiner Art Unit 1755